

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application and Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 16, 23 and 25 are amended. Support for amendments to Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 16, 23 and 25 can be found, for example, in the specification in paragraphs [0087-92]. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Izumi (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0132584) in view of Lauper (U.S. Pat. No. 2002/0098830).

Before turning to the outstanding prior art rejections, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed in Claim 1, for example, would be helpful.

Claim 1 describes a wireless communication system which includes a plurality of terminals. In a non-limiting example, support for Claim 1 is found in Figure 10 where, for example, the system is shown to include ad-hoc network including Terminal A and Terminal B. Terminal A, using the ad-hoc network, a beacon signal is sent to Terminal B (the beacon signal finding support in Figure 11) that includes a network identifier, used to identify the issuing terminal of a certificate of privilege, a beacon origination identifier and an operation mode indicator, used to indicate the operation mode of the terminal. Terminal B then responds by requesting authentication using the type of certificate of privilege which matches the certificate of privilege identified in the network identifier and indicates a right concerning the operation mode.

Turning now to the §103(a) rejection in the outstanding Office Action, Applicants respectfully traverse the §103(a) rejection based on Izumi and Lauper for the following reasons.

Amended Claim 1 recites, in part,

a first terminal configured to send, using the ad-hoc network, a signal that includes beacon information having a first identifier that identifies the origin of the sent beacon and a second identifier that identifies an issuing terminal of a certificate of privilege; and

a second terminal configured to send, using the ad-hoc network, an authentication request to the first terminal in response to the signal sent from the first terminal by providing the certificate of privilege which matches the second identifier

Claims 3, 7, 9, 16, 23 and 25 recite similar features.

Izumi describes a Bluetooth system in which devices such as facsimile 101, cordless telephone 102, PC 103, digital camera 104 and printer 105 transmit ID number and attribute information to one another. The ID number includes in the transmittal information expresses the information of identifying the device which is transmitting the information.

In contrast, Claim 1 recites transmitting a beacon from a first terminal to a second terminal, the beacon including an identifier that identifies an issuing terminal of the certificate of privilege. Izumi does not describe or suggest this feature.

In other words, Claim 1 recites transmitting a beacon that includes information that identifies the terminal identifier of the terminal that has issued the attribute certificate to the terminal transmitting the beacon. In contrast, Izumi merely describes transmitting an ID number of the device sending the message.

In addition, the further cited Lauper reference does not cure the above noted deficiencies of Izumi.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 and claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Izumi and Lauper considered individually or in any proper combination. Although of differing statutory class, and/or scope, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 3, 7, 9, 16, 23 and 25 and claims depending therefrom also patentably define over the cited references.

response to the signal sent from the first terminal when the operation mode of the first terminal coincides with an operation mode of the second terminal, by providing a certificate of privilege indicating a right concerning the operation mode of the second terminal

Claims 15, 21, 23, 25 and 26 recite similar features.

Each of the above noted claims recites that the authentication request includes an operation mode and that the first and second terminals are only authenticated if they have matching operation modes.

The outstanding Office Action cites Figure 7 and 8 of Izumi as teaching this feature. However, Figures 7 and 8 and the corresponding disclosure merely describe the registration process for registering a Bluetooth device with another Bluetooth device. Nowhere is it described that two terminals must have the same operation mode in order to authenticate with one another. One example of the operation mode described in the present specification is found in paragraph 0078. In this paragraph, it is described that the operation mode is either a private or public mode. If one user has the operation mode set to private and the other to public the authentication will not continue. This feature is not described in the Izumi reference, not in Figures 7 and 8 nor in any other part of this reference.

In addition, the further cited Lauper reference does not cure the above noted deficiencies of Izumi with respect to the operation mode.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2, 15, 21, 23, 25 and 26 patentably distinguish over Izumi and Lauper considered individually or in any proper combination for at least the above noted reasons.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\JL\249225US\249225US_AM(12.19.2006).DOC